

ON THE LIMITED SIZES OF DUSTY STARBURSTING REGIONS AT HIGH REDSHIFTS

HAOJING YAN AND ZHIYUAN MA

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Missouri-Columbia, USA

Draft version January 26, 2016

ABSTRACT

Using the far-infrared data obtained by the *Herschel Space Observatory*, we study the relation between the infrared luminosity (L_{IR}) and the dust temperature (T) of dusty starbursting galaxies at high redshifts (high- z). We focus on the total infrared luminosity from the cold-dust component ($L_{IR}^{(cd)}$), whose emission can be described by a modified black body (MBB) of a single temperature (T_{mbb}). An object on the ($L_{IR}^{(cd)}$, T_{mbb}) plane can be explained by the equivalent of the Stefan-Boltzmann law for a MBB with an effective radius of R_{eff} . We show that R_{eff} is a good measure of the combined size of the dusty starbursting regions (DSBRs) of the host galaxy. In at least one case where the individual DSBRs are well resolved through strong gravitational lensing, R_{eff} is consistent with the direct size measurement. We show that the observed L_{IR} - T relation is simply due to the limited R_{eff} ($\lesssim 2$ kpc). The small R_{eff} values also agree with the compact sizes of the DSBRs seen in the local universe. However, previous interferometric observations to resolve high- z dusty starbursting galaxies often quote much larger sizes. This inconsistency can be reconciled by the blending effect when considering that the current interferometry might still not be of sufficient resolution. From R_{eff} we infer the lower limits to the volume densities of the star formation rate (“minSFR3D”) in the DSBRs, and find that the L_{IR} - T relation outlines a boundary on the ($L_{IR}^{(cd)}$, T) plane, below which is the “zone of avoidance” in terms of minSFR3D.

Subject headings: infrared: galaxies; galaxies: starburst; galaxies: high-redshift, galaxies: evolution

1. INTRODUCTION

Dusty infrared (IR) galaxies are known to have a correlation between their infrared luminosities and dust temperatures (“ L_{IR} - T relation”). Generally speaking, ultra-luminous infrared galaxies (ULIRGs; $L_{IR} \sim 10^{12-13} L_{\odot}$) and hyper-luminous infrared galaxies (HyLIRGs; $L_{IR} \gtrsim 10^{13} L_{\odot}$) have typical dust temperatures of ~ 40 – 60 K, while luminous infrared galaxies (LIRGs; $L_{IR} \sim 10^{11-12} L_{\odot}$) and others at lower luminosities have lower dust temperatures of ~ 20 – 30 K. This trend was clearly revealed when sub-millimeter galaxies (SMGs), which are high- z ULIRGs, were compared to ULIRGs and other IR galaxies in the local universe (e.g., Blain et al. 2003; Chapman et al. 2003). There have been a number of studies to understand the nature of this relation and its dispersions, such as its dependence on redshifts, different galaxy populations, etc. (e.g. Chapman et al. 2005; Kovács et al. 2006; Clements et al. 2010; Magdis et al. 2010; Hwang et al. 2010; Symeonidis et al. 2013).

In Ma & Yan (2015, hereafter MY15), we have studied the quasars from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) that have far-IR (FIR) counterparts in the wide-field survey data from the *Herschel* Space Observatory (Pilbratt et al. 2010). We have shown that the majority of them are ULIRGs, and that their FIR emission originated from the cold-dust component is predominantly powered by starbursts rather than active galactic nuclei (AGN). One of our conclusions is that they follow the same L_{IR} - T relation. We have further shown that this relation is simply due to the limited maximum size of the combined dusty starbursting regions (hereafter DSBRs) in the host galaxies.

The motivation of our current work is that this maximum size is only around ~ 2 kpc, which seems to be significantly smaller than the claimed physical sizes of high- z ULIRGs based on a number of direct measurements through sub-millimeter (sub-mm) or radio interferometry. These observations have sub-arcsec resolutions, and typically result in rather extended sizes of ~ 4 – 8 kpc or even larger (e.g., Chapman et al. 2004; Biggs & Ivison 2008; Younger et al. 2008, 2010; Simpson et al. 2015).

Here we further investigate this problem, using an enlarged sample that incorporates different high- z IR galaxy populations. Throughout this *Letter*, we adopt the following cosmological parameters: $\Omega_M = 0.27$, $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.73$ and $H_0 = 71$ km/s/Mpc.

2. DATA AND ANALYSIS

We followed MY15 in this current analysis. Only the objects that have spectroscopic redshifts were used. The FIR counterpart identification was mainly based on the latest source catalogs from three major wide field surveys by *Herschel*, namely, the Herschel Multi-tiered Extragalactic Survey (HerMES, ~ 100 deg²; Oliver et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2013), the Herschel Stripe 82 Survey (HerS, ~ 80 deg²; Viero et al. 2014), and the Scientific Demonstration Phase data of the Herschel Astrophysical Tera-hertz Large Area Survey (H-ATLAS SDP, ~ 19.3 deg²; Eales et al. 2010; Ibar et al. 2010; Pascale et al. 2011; Rigby et al. 2011). The FIR spectral energy distributions (SEDs) were constructed using the three-band photometry from the Spectral and Photometric Imaging REceiver (SPIRE; Griffin et al. 2010) at 250, 350 and 500 μ m. We only considered the objects that are detected in all these three bands.

2.1. Input samples

The largest addition to the MY15 sample is through the use of the 13th edition Véron Catalogue of Quasars and Active Nuclei (Véron-Cetty & Véron 2010), which contains 34 231 and 133 332 AGN and quasars, respectively (hereafter “V-AGN” and “V-QSO”, respectively). The next is from Casey et al. (2012, “C12”), which contains 767 spectroscopically confirmed SPIRE sources in the HerMES fields. We also included the SMGs from Chapman et al. (2005, “C05”) and Ivison et al. (2005, “I05”), and a few sources of mixed selections from Magdis et al. (2011, “M11”) and Yan et al. (2014, “Y14”). Any duplicates among these sources and/or the MY15 sample were removed. As in MY15, we obtained the SPIRE photometry by matching the sources to the aforementioned *Herschel* catalogs, adopting the matching radius of 3'' to minimize the contaminated sources due to blending.

We also incorporated a number of objects that are outside of the aforementioned *Herschel* survey fields but have reported SPIRE photometry. These include the high-*z* quasars from Leipski et al. (2013, “L13”), the radio galaxies from Drouart et al. (2014, “D14”), and the 3C radio sources from Podigachoski et al. (2015, “P15”). While these objects certainly contain powerful AGN, we are convinced (as are these authors also inclined to believe) that their FIR emissions should be dominated by starbursts as in the SDSS quasars presented in MY15.

Finally, we included a few high-*z* ULIRGs that are known to be amplified by strong gravitational lensing, which all have spectroscopic redshifts, reported SPIRE photometry and adopted amplification factors (“ μ ”). These include the most highly lensed SMG from Swinbank et al. (2010) and Ivison et al. (2010, “S&I10”), the strong Planck source from Fu et al. (2012, “F12”), the South Pole Telescope’s lensed galaxies from Weiß et al. (2013) and Hezaveh et al. (2013, “W&H13”), and the lensed galaxies in the H-ATLAS SDP from Bussmann et al. (2013, “B13”; only the two sources with grade “A” lensing models and $\mu > 10$ were used).

2.2. SED fitting and the final sample

As in MY15, we only studied the coldest dust component, which dominates the FIR emission that is sampled by the SPIRE bands. While this will certainly underestimate (by ~ 0.1 – 0.2 dex) the total IR luminosity that consists of the contributions from other components of higher temperatures, the simplification has the advantages that the associated luminosity can be safely attributed to starbursts and that the dust temperature is uniquely defined. Following MY15, we analyzed their FIR SEDs by fitting a single-temperature, modified blackbody (MBB) spectrum. We briefly describe the procedure below.

We used the **cmcirsed** code of Casey (2012) to perform the MBB fitting. The MBB spectrum can be written as

$$S_{\lambda}(\lambda) \equiv N \cdot I_{mbb}(\lambda) \\ = N \frac{1 - e^{-(\frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda})^{\beta}}}{1 - e^{-1}} \frac{(\frac{2hc^2}{\lambda^5})}{e^{hc/(\lambda k T_{mbb})} - 1}, \quad (1)$$

where T_{mbb} is the characteristic temperature of the MBB, N is the scaling factor that is related to the intrinsic lu-




Figure 1. Examples of FIR SED fitting, with the derived quantities labeled. The data points are the photometry in SPIRE 250, 350 and 500 μm , respectively, while the curves are the best-fit MBB models. One of the objects has photometry in two more bands bluer than the SPIRE bands, which were not used in the fit but are plotted here to show that the fit based on only the SPIRE bands indeed can get reliable results.

minosity, β is the emissivity (when $\beta = 0$ Equation 1 reduces to the form of a black body), and λ_0 is the reference wavelength where the opacity is unity. We adopted $\beta = 1.5$ and $\lambda_0 = 100 \mu\text{m}$. The total IR luminosity of the cold-dust component, $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$, can be obtained as

$$L_{IR}^{(cd)} \equiv L_{IR}^{mbb} \equiv \int_{8\mu\text{m}}^{1000\mu\text{m}} S_{\lambda}(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (2)$$

by integrating the best-fit MBB model $S_{\lambda}(\lambda)$ from 8 to 1000 μm .

Our further analysis is based on $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$ and T_{mbb} thus obtained. We only retained the objects that have reasonable SED fitting quality ($\chi^2 < 10$) and reliable T_{mbb} measurements ($T_{mbb}/\Delta T_{mbb} \geq 3$), which sum up to 400 objects in total. As examples, Figure 1 shows the SED fitting results for a few objects from our final sample. Figure 2 shows the L_{IR} – T relation from the entire sample, where the number of contributing objects from each initial sample is also labeled. The distributions of redshifts and $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$ are shown in the first two histograms in Figure 3.

3. INTERPRETATIONS

As addressed in MY15, the L_{IR} – T trend revealed in Figure 2 is not due to selection effects but is governed by the equivalent of Stefan-Boltzmann law in case of MBB. Here we fully develop this idea.

3.1. Effective radius of DSBRS

The location of an object on the $(L_{IR}^{(cd)}, T_{mbb})$ plane is determined by the intensity of the MBB as expressed in Equation (1). To obtain the total power radiated from




Figure 2. L_{IR} - T relation as revealed by our final sample. The individual objects from different input samples and the total numbers are shown in different symbols of colors as in the legend. The dashed curves are a family of MBB S-B equivalent with different R_{eff} , whose values are marked next to the curves (see §3.1). The right panel shows $\tilde{\sigma}(T)/\sigma$ (red dashed curve) and the fit (grey solid curve).

the cold-dust component of the object, i.e., its total luminosity, one should integrate the MBB function $I_{mbb}(\lambda)$ over wavelength and over the solid angle (“ Ω ”) that its surface area (“ A ”) subtends as seen from the source, and multiply by this surface area:

$$L = A \cdot \int_0^\infty I_{mbb}(\lambda) d\lambda \int d\Omega \quad (3)$$

$$= A \cdot \frac{2\pi k^4}{h^3 c^2} T^4 \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-(\tau u)^\beta}}{1 - e^{-1}} \frac{u^3}{e^u - 1} du,$$

where we make the substitution of $u = \frac{hc}{\lambda kT}$, set $\tau \equiv \frac{\lambda_0 kT}{hc}$, and also write T_{mbb} as T for convenience. If there were no the modified term $(1 - e^{-(\tau u)^\beta})$ to the Planck’s black body function, the integral above would be $\pi^4/15$ and Equation (3) would reduce to the Stefan-Boltzmann law, i.e., $L = A\sigma T^4$, where $\sigma = \frac{2\pi^5 K^4}{15h^3 c^2}$ is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant. For simplicity, we introduce

$$\tilde{\sigma}(T, \beta, \lambda_0) = \frac{2\pi k^4}{h^3 c^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-(\tau u)^\beta}}{1 - e^{-1}} \frac{u^3}{e^u - 1} du,$$

which is the equivalent of the Stefan-Boltzmann constant in the MBB case. Note that $\tilde{\sigma}$ is dependent of T because $\tau \equiv \frac{\lambda_0 kT}{hc}$ is involved.

In the context of this work, we can take the approximation that the integral in Equation (3) is only over the conventional total IR regime of $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ from 8 to 1000 μm as in Equation (2) such that $L \approx L_{IR}^{(cd)}$, i.e., we have $L_{IR}^{(cd)} = A\tilde{\sigma}T_{mbb}^4$, which we shall refer to as the “MBB S-B equivalent”.

Assuming spherical symmetry, we can define an “effective radius”, R_{eff} , such that $A = 4\pi R_{eff}^2$. This is to imagine that all the star-forming regions within the galaxy are combined together and that the sum can be approximated by an effective sphere with the radius of R_{eff} . We thus have

$$L_{IR}^{(cd)} = 4\pi R_{eff}^2 \tilde{\sigma} T_{mbb}^4. \quad (4)$$

For T_{mbb} within the range of interest (~ 10 – 100 K), the deviation of $\tilde{\sigma}$ from σ is within a factor of two and can be well approximated as

$$\tilde{\sigma}(T)/\sigma = 10^{-3}(-3.03T^{1.5} + 45.55T - 127.53), \quad (5)$$

for our choice of $\lambda_0 = 100 \mu\text{m}$ and $\beta = 1.5$ (see the right panel of Figure 2).

Thus the data points on the $(L_{IR}^{(cd)}, T_{mbb})$ plane can be explained by a family of MBB S-B equivalent curves of different R_{eff} , which are shown in Figure 2. A pair of $(L_{IR}^{(cd)}, T_{mbb})$ values allow us determine R_{eff} of the combined dusty star forming regions in the galaxy under question. MY15 uses the same argument, and shows that (1) in the low luminosity regime the increasing of $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$ is due to the increasing of R_{eff} , while in the high luminosity regime the increase of $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$ has to be attributed to the increased heating intensity, and (2) R_{eff} cannot be increased arbitrarily and has a limit of $\lesssim 2$ kpc. MY15 takes a less rigorous approach and approximates the temperature-dependent $\tilde{\sigma}$ by σT^α and obtains $L_{IR} = 4\pi R_{eff}^2 \sigma T^{4.32}$. The derivation of Equation (4) here is more appropriate, which results in more

accurate determination of R_{eff} .

The histograms of T_{mbb} and R_{eff} are shown in Figure 3 for all the objects in our sample. The vast majority of them (98.3%) have $R_{eff} \leq 2$ kpc, and this limit is the reason for the observed $L_{IR}-T$ relation.

3.2. SFR surface and volume densities

Following Kennicutt (1998) to convert the infrared luminosity to the SFR and assuming the initial mass function of Chabrier (2003), we get $SFR = 1.0 \times 10^{-10} L_{IR}^{(cd)} / L_{\odot} \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. From the R_{eff} values above, we can derive the SFR surface densities (hereafter “SFR2D”, or “ Σ_{SFR} ”) that are often used in the literature, where the “surface area” going into the calculation is the area of the DSBs projected on the sky. Assuming spherical symmetry, the total surface area of the i -th DSB is $4\pi R_i^2$, where R_i is its radius. We further make a highly simplified assumption that all the DSBs in a given galaxy have the same dust temperature. The definition of R_{eff} thus implies that $4\pi R_{eff}^2 = \sum_i 4\pi R_i^2$, where the summation over i goes through all the DSBs. The projected surface area of the i -th DSB on the sky is πR_i^2 , and hence $\Sigma_{SFR} = SFR / \sum_i \pi R_i^2 = SFR / \pi R_{eff}^2$. Considering Equation (4) and that $\sigma = 1.411 \times 10^5 L_{\odot} \text{ kpc}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}$, we have $\Sigma_{SFR} = 5.644 \times 10^{-5} (\tilde{\sigma}/\sigma) T_{mbb}^4$. This means that Σ_{SFR} is constant for a fixed T_{mbb} .

Similarly, we can calculate the SFR volume density (hereafter “SFR3D”, or “ ρ_{SFR} ”). Under the same assumptions as above, we define a different effective sphere with the radius of r_{eff} , whose volume is equal to the sum of the volumes of the individual DSBs in a galaxy, i.e., $\frac{4}{3}\pi r_{eff}^3 = \sum_i \frac{4}{3}\pi R_i^3$. It is obvious that $R_{eff} \geq r_{eff}$, and generally there is no easy way to infer r_{eff} from R_{eff} . However, in the limiting case that there is only one DSB in the galaxy under question, we should have $R_{eff} = r_{eff}$. Therefore, we can calculate the *minimum* SFR volume density (hereafter “minSFR3D”, or “ ρ_{SFR}^{min} ”) as $\rho_{SFR}^{min} = SFR / (\frac{4}{3}\pi R_{eff}^3)$.

The histograms of SFR2D and minSFR3D are shown in Figure 3.

3.3. Nature of the $L_{IR}-T$ relation

The $L_{IR}-T$ relation now has a new meaning. As a pair of $(L_{IR}^{(cd)}, T_{mbb})$ correspond to one R_{eff} value, and hence one minSFR3D value, the $L_{IR}^{(cd)}-T$ plane can be converted into a minSFR3D “surface”, which is shown in Figure 4, where the average trend based on the data points in Figure 2 is also displayed. It is immediately clear that our objects form the observed $L_{IR}-T$ relation because they outline a region that has a narrow spread in minSFR3D.

We emphasize again that, as shown in the simulation of MY15 (see also §2 above), the lack of objects in the area below this relation cannot be due to selection bias. From Figure 4, it is clear that this high- $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$, low- T_{mbb} area corresponds to low minSFR3D. We therefore suggest that this area is a “zone of avoidance” in terms of minSFR3D. In other words, very cold ULIRGs or HyLIRGs should be very rare, because they would require very large R_{eff}

(and hence very low minSFRD) in order to achieve a high IR luminosity at a low dust temperature. On the other hand, the lack of objects in the area above the current $L_{IR}-T$ relation outlined by our objects *could be* due to the possible selection bias in our current sample, where we limit to $S_{250} \geq 50$ mJy in order to include the most reliable detections in the *Herschel* SPIRE bands. We refer the readers to the discussion in MY15 for details (see §4.1 and Figure 12 therein).

3.4. Consistency with the direct measurements

While the limited R_{eff} ($\lesssim 2$ kpc) seem to contradict the claimed extended sizes of high- z SMGs (see §1), there is a reconciliation when considering that even the sub-arcsec sub-mm interferometry might still cannot resolve individual DSBs at high- z ($0.1'' \sim 0.8$ kpc at $z \approx 1-4$) if they are too close to each other. In other words, the very extended sub-mm morphologies could simply be due to the blending of a number of discrete DSBs that are widely separated but still not resolved by the interferometry available today.

Currently, the only way to resolve the individual DSBs at high- z is through strong gravitational lensing, in which case the highly amplified background source could show its morphology in great details, albeit in the distorted image plane. By properly modeling the lens, its image in the source plane could be reconstructed to reveal the intrinsic morphology. However, the accuracy of the reconstruction depends highly on how strong the amplification is and how well the lens is modeled.

Unfortunately, there are still not many such measurements publicly available for us to compare to, especially when we require spectroscopic redshifts and the SPIRE photometry. The best example to date is the SMG SMMJ2135-0102 from S&I10, which is amplified by a factor of ~ 32.5 . Its FIR emission is dominated by four individual DSBs, each being mirrored into two images. By averaging the results from the reconstructions based on the two sets of mirrored images, the intrinsic radii of these four DSBs are 390.0, 290.5, 192.5, and 94 pc, respectively. As these radii are the FWHM sizes, and hence only enclose $\sim 76.1\%$ of the total light from each DSB, they should be corrected by multiplying a factor of $\sqrt{1/0.761} = 1.146$ to the “full sizes”.

Following §3.2, we get $\sqrt{\sum_i R_i^2} = 609$ pc. In §3.1, we

obtained $L_{IR}^{(cd)} = 1.74 \times 10^{12} L_{\odot}$, $T_{mbb} = 39.0$ K and $R_{eff} = 677$ pc. This size agrees with the above to $\sim 11\%$. Considering that these four DSBs, while being the dominant sources, might not contribute 100% of the total $L_{IR}^{(cd)}$, the actual agreement could be even better.

For comparison, here we also discuss the case of Arp 220, which is the representative of the classic (low-redshift) ULIRG population. Arp 220 has two nuclei, which have recently been directly resolved in sub-mm by Scoville et al. (2015) using the Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array (ALMA). Based on their highest resolution observations at $870 \mu\text{m}$ (half-power bandwidth of $0.52'' \times 0.39''$), these authors derived the FWHM sizes of the two nuclei (assuming Gaussian profiles) as 130×87 and 137×116 pc, respectively. Using spheres for approximation, we obtain the equivalent radii of 106 and




Figure 3. Statistics of the objects from our sample.

126 pc, respectively. They also suggest that these two nuclei account for $\sim 71\text{--}76\%$ of the total FIR continuum, and hence we adopt the middle value of 74%. Similar to the calculation above, we correct the measured FWHM sizes by a factor of $\sqrt{1/(0.761 \times 0.74)} = 1.333$ to the full sizes, and obtain $\sqrt{\sum_i R_i^2} = 219$ pc. As Arp 220 is very

close (we adopt 77 Mpc as its luminosity distance), using the SPIRE bands alone would not result in a reasonable fit to its SED because these bands are too far away from the peak of its FIR emission. Therefore, we use the photometry at $> 40\mu\text{m}$, retrieved from the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database. We obtain $L_{\text{IR}}^{(\text{cd})} = 1.32 \times 10^{12} L_{\odot}$, $T_{\text{mbb}} = 55.8$ K and $R_{\text{eff}} = 260$ pc. Considering the uncertainties (especially the fractional contribution from the two nuclei to the total FIR emission), the agreement is very reasonable.

4. DISCUSSION

Our MBB model fixes λ_0 to $100\mu\text{m}$, which is about the smallest choice adopted in the literature. As discussed in MY15 (see Appendix A), the difference in λ_0 impacts the derived T_{mbb} significantly but has little effect on $L_{\text{IR}}^{(\text{cd})}$. If the SED fitting can achieve the similar quality, adopting a larger λ_0 will result in a higher T_{mbb} , and hence a smaller R_{eff} . For a given λ_0 , R_{eff} still sensitively depends on T_{mbb} . For example, if we take a crude approximation and ignore the temperature dependence of $\tilde{\sigma}$, we have $\Delta R_{\text{eff}}/R_{\text{eff}} \approx 2 \times \Delta T_{\text{mbb}}/T_{\text{mbb}}$. Therefore, it is difficult to derive R_{eff} to an accuracy better than

a factor of a few, especially at $L_{\text{IR}}^{(\text{cd})} \lesssim 10^{11} L_{\odot}$ where the MBB S-B equivalent curves are highly degenerated. However, our main conclusions still hold regardless of such limitations.

First of all, R_{eff} cannot be increased arbitrarily. Even in the HyLIRG regime, it is still mostly confined to $\lesssim 2$ kpc. While in the low luminosity regime the increasing of $L_{\text{IR}}^{(\text{cd})}$ can be achieved by increasing R_{eff} (e.g., increasing the number of DSBs), in the high luminosity regime this can only be achieved by increasing the strength of the starburst (i.e., reflected in the rapid increase of T_{mbb}). MY15 has already reached this conclusion, and here we reinforce it with an enlarged sample that consists of objects from different initial selections, such as SMGs, high- z radio galaxies, etc.

Second, the $L_{\text{IR}}-T$ relation reflects the equivalent of the Stefan-Boltzmann law in case of MBB and the aforementioned limit to R_{eff} . For this reason, this relation outlines the boundary of minSFR3D, which provides new clues in understanding dusty starbursting environment. The value of minSFR3D should be quite close to the actual SFR volume density, although strictly speaking it is only the lower limit. In the simplest case where the DSBs are all spheres of the same radius and dust temperature, $\rho_{\text{SFR}} = \sqrt{N} \rho_{\text{SFR}}^{\text{min}}$, where N is the total number of DSBs in the galaxy.

Third, the small R_{eff} values suggest that the DSBs in high- z ULIRGs are as physically compact as their counterparts in the local universe. It is true that a small R_{eff} could still be the result of an extended DSB with a low filling factor. However, our test cases in §3.4 strongly




Figure 4. Interpretation of the $L_{\text{IR}}-T$ relation in terms of minSFR3D. The points are the averaged relation based on the data shown in Figure 2, binned in 0.2 dex in $L_{\text{IR}}^{\text{cd}}$. The grey dashed curves are the same as in Figure 2. The minSFRD3D values on this plane are shown as the color-coded surface, and the green curves mark a few representative values.

supports the scenario that DSBRs are universally compact.

We acknowledge the support of the University of Missouri Research Board Grant RB 15-22 and NASA’s Astrophysics Data Analysis Program under grant number NNX15AM92G. We have made use of the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED), which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with NASA.

REFERENCES

- Biggs, A. D., & Ivison, R. J. 2008, *MNRAS*, 385, 893 1
- Blain, A. W., Barnard, V. E., & Chapman, S. C. 2003, *MNRAS*, 338, 733 1
- Bussmann, R. S., Pérez-Fournon, I., Amber, S., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 779, 25 2
- Casey, C. M. 2012, *MNRAS*, 425, 3094 2
- Casey, C. M., Berta, S., Béthermin, M., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 761, 140 2
- Chabrier, G. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763 4
- Chapman, S. C., Blain, A. W., Smail, I., & Ivison, R. J. 2005, *ApJ*, 622, 772 1, 2
- Chapman, S. C., Helou, G., Lewis, G. F., & Dale, D. A. 2003, *ApJ*, 588, 186 1
- Chapman, S. C., Smail, I., Windhorst, R., Muxlow, T., & Ivison, R. J. 2004, *ApJ*, 611, 732 1
- Clements, D. L., Dunne, L., & Eales, S. 2010, *MNRAS*, 403, 274 1
- Drouart, G., De Breuck, C., Vernet, J., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 566, A53 2
- Eales, S., Dunne, L., Clements, D., et al. 2010, *PASP*, 122, 499 1
- Fu, H., Jullo, E., Cooray, A., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 753, 134 2
- Griffin, M. J., Abergel, A., Abreu, A., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L3 1
- Hezaveh, Y. D., Marrone, D. P., Fassnacht, C. D., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 132 2
- Hwang, H. S., Elbaz, D., Magdis, G., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 75 1
- Ibar, E., Ivison, R. J., Cava, A., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 38 1
- Ivison, R. J., Smail, I., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2005, *MNRAS*, 364, 1025 2
- Ivison, R. J., Swinbank, A. M., Swinyard, B., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L35 2
- Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 1998, *ARA&A*, 36, 189 4
- Kovács, A., Chapman, S. C., Dowell, C. D., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 650, 592 1
- Leipski, C., Meisenheimer, K., Walter, F., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 772, 103 2
- Ma, Z., & Yan, H. 2015, *ApJ*, 811, 58 (MY15) 1
- Magdis, G. E., Elbaz, D., Hwang, H. S., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 720, L185 1
- Magdis, G. E., Daddi, E., Elbaz, D., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 740, L15 2
- Oliver, S. J., Bock, J., Altieri, B., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 424, 1614 1
- Pascale, E., Auld, R., Dariush, A., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 911 1
- Pilbratt, G. L., Riedinger, J. R., Passvogel, T., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L1 1
- Podigachoski, P., Barthel, P. D., Haas, M., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 575, A80 2
- Rigby, E. E., Maddox, S. J., Dunne, L., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 2336 1
- Scoville, N., Sheth, K., Walter, F., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 800, 70 4
- Simpson, J. M., Smail, I., Swinbank, A. M., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 799, 81 1
- Swinbank, A. M., Smail, I., Longmore, S., et al. 2010, *Nature*, 464, 733 2
- Symeonidis, M., Vaccari, M., Berta, S., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 431, 2317 1
- Véron-Cetty, M.-P., & Véron, P. 2010, *A&A*, 518, A10 2
- Viero, M. P., Asboth, V., Roseboom, I. G., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 210, 22 1
- Wang, L., Viero, M., Clarke, C., et al. 2013, *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1312.0552 1
- Weiß, A., De Breuck, C., Marrone, D. P., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 88 2
- Yan, H., Stefanon, M., Ma, Z., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 213, 2 2

- Younger, J. D., Fazio, G. G., Wilner, D. J., et al. 2008, ApJ, 688, 59–1
- Younger, J. D., Fazio, G. G., Ashby, M. L. N., et al. 2010, MNRAS, 407, 1268–1